<p style="text-align:center">REMARKS</p>

Claims 1-8, 10-15, 17-23, and 27 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 24 and 26 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. A version of all pending claims is located at pages 2-7 of this Reply. Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I.   Rejection of Claims 24 and 26 Under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 24 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reason. Claims 24 and 26 have been cancelled herein without prejudice or disclaimer. Accordingly, the rejection is now moot and this rejection should be withdrawn.

II.   Rejection of Claims 1-8, 10-15, 17-23 and 27 Under 35 U.S.C §112

Claims 1-8, 10-15, 17-23 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons.

Applicants' subject matter teaches a system that employs application developer coded extensible proxies that have access to method interception and remote functionality and data. The system, unlike conventional systems, includes an application code generic proxy that can receive an intercepted method call that can invoke the method on the object imaged by the proxy, that can receive results from the object imaged by the proxy, and that can pass results to the entity that generated the intercepted method call. In particular, the application code may be employed in actions including, monitoring remote methods calls, caching local data, controlling remote method call invocations, and machine learning involved in optimizing remote method call invocation. The process of optimizing remote method invocation involves improving performance. For example, the application code generic proxy can determine an inquiry on a first remote object takes 60 seconds, while a response time of 5 seconds is desired. Thus the proxy can acquire the result from a different remote object and compare the average response times to determine how more optimal response times can be achieved. (*See* page 12, lines 23-29). It is submitted that the foregoing example provides a method for machine learning to

optimize remote method call invocation. The example clearly indicates a method to improve performance and optimize remote method invocation. Thus, the claims are supported by the specification, which when filed, contained sufficient information regarding the subject matter of the claims as to enable one skilled in the pertinent art to make and use the claimed invention. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

<div align="center">CONCLUSION</div>

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP243US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/
Himanshu S. Amin
Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731